Table II-2
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
NATURAL RESOURCES GEOLOGY, GEOLOGIC HAZARDS, AND SOILS		
Alternative 1 would have a local, long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impact on geologic resources and soils associated with hazards from unavoidable seismic ground shaking, the potential for infrequent but damaging rockfalls due to the proximity of facilities to the sheer granite cliffs, and continued soil compaction, surface runoff, and soil erosion.	Soil degradation associated with construction activities under Alternative 2 would occur through each project phase and would result in a local, short-term, moderate, adverse impact. As identified in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, standard mitigation including erosion controls and native foliage protection would reduce the construction-related impacts to a negligible to minor intensity. Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact. The beneficial impacts of Alternative 2 associated with restoration and revegetation activities, improved seismic safety associated with new building construction, and relocation of essential facilities outside the base of talus zone would offset the adverse effects associated with construction impacts, hazards from unavoidable seismic ground shaking, and continued placement of facilities within the base of talus and shadow line zones.	As under Alternative 2, soil degradation associated with construction activities under Alternative 3 would occur through each project phase and would result in a local, short-term, moderate, adverse impact. As identified in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, standard mitigation including erosion controls and native foliage protection would reduce the construction-related impacts to a negligible to minor intensity. Overall, Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact. The beneficial impacts of Alternative 3 associated with restoration and revegetation activities, improved seismic safety associated with new building construction, and relocation of essential facilities outside the base of talus zone would offset adverse effects associated with construction impacts, hazards from unavoidable seismic ground shaking, and continued placement of facilities within the base of talus and shadow line zones.
Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, minor, beneficial impact with respect to the overall seismic safety and reduction of rockfall hazards. Although the earthquake and rockfall hazard would remain unchanged at the project site under Alternative 1, other projects within the Valley would comply with the Geologic Hazard Guidelines and would reduce the overall risk of geologic hazards. The regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact to soil resources under the cumulative projects would offset the potential soil degradation under Alternative 1 at the project site.	Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact with respect to overall seismic safety and the reduction of rockfall hazards; although the earthquake and rockfall hazards remain largely unchanged at the Yosemite Lodge Area Redevelopment site under Alternative 2, other projects within the Valley and implementation of the Geologic Hazard Guidelines would reduce the overall risk of geologic hazards. The regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact to soil resources under the cumulative projects would add to the soil restoration proposed under Alternative 2, resulting in a net regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact to soil resources.	Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact with respect to overall seismic safety and the reduction of rockfall hazards; although the earthquake and rockfall hazards remain largely unchanged at the Yosemite Lodge Area Redevelopment site under Alternative 3, other projects within the Valley and implementation of the Geologic Hazard Guidelines would reduce the overall risk of geologic hazards. The regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact to soil resources under the cumulative projects would add to the soil restoration proposed under Alternative 3, resulting in a net regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact to soil resources.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
FLOODPLAINS AND W ATER RESOURCES		
Alternative 1 would have a local, long-term, minor to moderate, adverse effect on floodplains and water resources. The buildings that are currently in the floodplain could divert, focus, or otherwise alter flood flow during another major flood in Yosemite Valley, resulting in injury to visitors and damage to buildings. The diversion dam and revetments would remain in place, adversely affecting the Merced River floodplain and Yosemite Creek flow. Impervious surface conditions at the site would continue to contribute to adverse effects on drainage system capacity, and the facilities and uses in and immediately adjacent to the Merced River would continue to adversely affect water quality. The beneficial impacts on water quality associated with remediation of leaking underground storage tank sites would somewhat offset these adverse effects.	Stormwater runoff from construction sites would result in a moderate adverse impact to surface water quality. Implementation of mitigation measures, including development of a comprehensive stormwater pollution prevention plan (see Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives), would reduce the intensity of the construction-related impacts to negligible. Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on floodplains and water resources. The beneficial impacts associated with removal of major flow impediments from the 100-year floodplain; removal of the diversion dam and revetments from the banks of Yosemite Creek to return the 100-year floodplain to near-natural, free-flow conditions; and improvements to the drainage system would largely offset the adverse effects associated with construction-related stormwater runoff and increased impervious surface area at the project site.	As with Alternative 2, stormwater runoff from construction sites would result in a moderate adverse impact to surface water quality. Implementation of mitigation measures, including development of a comprehensive stormwater pollution prevention plan (see Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives), would reduce the intensity of the construction-related impacts to negligible. Overall, Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on floodplains and water resources. The beneficial impacts associated with removal of major flow impediments from the 100-year floodplain; removal of the diversion dam and revetments from the banks of Yosemite Creek to return the 100-year floodplain to near-natural, free-flow conditions; and improvements to the drainage system would largely offset the adverse effects associated with construction-related stormwater runoff and increased impervious surface area at the project site.
The past, present, and future projects considered cumulatively with Alternative 1 would have a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial effect on hydrologic processes and water quality, because the long-term beneficial effects associated with the overall effort to improve water resources in Yosemite Valley and return natural flow to river and tributary systems overshadow the minor to moderate adverse impacts that would result from Alternative 1.	The past, present, and future projects considered cumulatively with the Alternative 2 would have a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial effect on hydrologic processes and water quality, because the removal of flow impediments and improvements to the drainage system under Alternative 2 would contribute to the long-term beneficial effects associated with the overall effort to improve water resources in Yosemite Valley and return natural flow to river and tributary systems. The beneficial impacts would offset the adverse construction- and development-related impacts associated with Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects.	The past, present, and future projects considered cumulatively with the Alternative 3 would have a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial effect on hydrologic processes and water quality, because the removal of flow impediments and improvements to the drainage system under Alternative 3 would contribute to the long-term beneficial effects associated with the overall effort to improve water resources in Yosemite Valley and return natural flow to river and tributary systems. The beneficial impacts would offset the adverse construction- and development-related impacts associated with Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
WETLANDS		
Alternative 1 would continue to have a local, long-term, moderate, adverse effect on wetlands in the project area by diminishing the size, integrity, and connectivity of jurisdictional wetlands and Cowardin wetlands (palustrine forest, palustrine scrub shrub, palustrine emergent, and riverine). Such impacts include habitat conversion due to conifer and non-native species invasion, degradation of wetlands due to development within the floodplain and heavy recreation-related foot traffic, and fragmentation due to the lack of hydrologic connectivity between wetlands.	Construction activities associated with Alternative 2, including installation and removal of utilities and development of project facilities, would have a moderate adverse impact due to disturbance of 0.43 acres of wetlands (specifically, riverine intermittent drainages). With implementation of mitigation measures (including wetland replacement, erosion control measures, spill prevention and pollution control measures, and wetland protection and compensation measures, such as installing protective fencing material to protect wetlands from construction activities, using silt fencing to reduce erosion, etc.), as described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, construction impacts to wetlands would be lessened to a minor adverse effect. Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact on wetlands. The beneficial effects associated with restoration and revegetation under this alternative would offset the adverse construction-related impacts.	Construction activities associated with Alternative 3, including installation and removal of utilities and development of project facilities, would have a moderate adverse impact due to disturbance of 0.41 acres of wetlands (specifically, riverine intermittent drainages). With implementation of mitigation measures (including wetland replacement, spill prevention and pollution control measures, and wetland protection and compensation measures, such as installing protective fencing material to protect wetlands from construction activities, using silt fencing to reduce erosion, etc.), as described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, construction impacts to wetlands would be lessened to a minor adverse effect. Overall, Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact on wetlands. The beneficial effects associated with restoration and revegetation under this alternative would offset the adverse construction-related impacts.
These cumulative projects and Alternative 1 would have an overall regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on wetlands in the area. The beneficial impacts of wetland restoration efforts in Yosemite Valley would offset the project-related adverse effects associated with diminishment of the size, integrity, and connectivity of wetlands in the project area.	Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in a local, long-term, major, beneficial impact with respect to wetlands. The beneficial impacts associated with the restoration and revegetation efforts under Alternative 2 would positively contribute to the Valleywide restoration efforts.	Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would result in a local, long-term, major, beneficial impact with respect to wetlands. The beneficial impacts associated with the restoration and revegetation efforts under Alternative 3 would positively contribute to the Valleywide restoration efforts.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
VEGETATION		
Alternative 1 would not provide a comprehensive approach to improvements, restoration, or management of natural and developed plant communities, resulting in continued and localized, long-term degradation. The size, continuity, and integrity of vegetation would continue to diminish due to conifer invasion in upland, meadow, and riparian communities; lack of fire; spread of fungus root rot (annosus and armillaria); human-related disturbances (including trampling); and spread of non-native species. The continued management of vegetation at the Yosemite Lodge Area Redevelopment site would result in a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact.	Compared to Alternative 1, Alternative 2 would alter the size, integrity, and continuity of vegetation due to the removal of 1,059 trees and potential construction-related vegetation trampling effects, resulting in a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact. Implementation of biological resource protection measures (such as installing temporary fencing, controlling and minimizing invasive non-native species, and implementing revegetation measures to restore disturbed areas), as described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, would somewhat offset this adverse effect although the impact would remain minor. Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact because the restoration and revegetation efforts would offset the adverse construction-related effect associated with tree removal.	Compared to Alternative 1, Alternative 3 would alter the size, integrity, and continuity of vegetation due to the removal of 1,036 trees and potential construction-related vegetation trampling effects, resulting in a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact. Implementation of biological resource protection measures (such as e.g., installing temporary fencing to protect remaining trees and highly sensitive biological resources, controlling and minimizing invasive non-native species, and implementing revegetation measures to restore disturbed areas) as described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, would somewhat offset this adverse effect although the impact would remain minor. Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact because the restoration and revegetation efforts would offset the adverse construction-related effect associated with tree removal.
Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects in Yosemite Valley would result in a local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on vegetation, due to the overall emphasis on restoring disturbed or developed land to natural conditions and improving the size, continuity, and integrity of vegetation. These beneficial effects would outweigh the moderate adverse effect associated with Alternative 1 and the adverse effects of cumulative development projects and construction activities.	Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact with respect to vegetation, because efforts to restore and revegetate developed and/or disturbed areas within the Valley and the project site would offset adverse impacts related to construction and increased development.	Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact with respect to vegetation, because efforts to restore and revegetate developed and/or disturbed areas within the Valley and the project site would offset adverse impacts related to construction and increased development.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
WILDLIFE		
Continued use of the project area would result in a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on wildlife due to habitat fragmentation as a result of buildings, roads, parking lots, and other development; vehicle and pedestrian noise; human presence; and other use-associated effects.	Construction-related activities would have a minor to moderate adverse effect on wildlife through habitat disturbance (including tree removal), noise, human presence, and operation of heavy equipment. Implementation of mitigation measures, such as preconstruction wildlife surveys and erosion and sedimentation control measures (see Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives), would reduce the magnitude of construction-related adverse effects on wildlife to minor. Moderate, adverse, operation-related effects on wildlife would occur through habitat fragmentation, increased human presence, expansion of development into undeveloped areas, and creation of facilities that could attract black bears to the project site. Food waste control and other measures developed in coordination with the Bear Management Council would reduce the severity of this adverse effect. The beneficial effects on wildlife and highly valued resources due to riparian and meadow habitat restoration activities, modification of Northside Drive into a multi-use paved trail, and restoration of the natural hydrology of Yosemite Creek would somewhat offset but not reduce the intensity of the adverse construction- and operation-related impacts associated with Alternative 2. Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, moderate, adverse effect on wildlife.	Similar to Alternative 2, construction-related activities under Alternative 3 would have a minor to moderate adverse effect on wildlife through habitat disturbance (including tree removal), noise, human presence, and operation of heavy equipment. Implementation of mitigation measures, such as preconstruction wildlife surveys and erosion and sedimentation control measures (see Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives), would reduce the magnitude of the construction-related adverse effects on wildlife to minor. Minor, adverse, operation-related effects on wildlife would occur through habitat fragmentation, increased human presence, and expansion of development into undeveloped areas. The beneficial effects on wildlife and highly valued resources due to riparian and meadow habitat restoration activities, modification of Northside Drive into a multi-use paved trail, and restoration of the natural hydrology of Yosemite Creek would offset the adverse construction- and operation-related impacts associated with Alternative 3. Overall, Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, minor, adverse effect on wildlife.
Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects in Yosemite Valley would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on wildlife, due to the overall emphasis on restoring disturbed or developed land to natural conditions and improving the health of ecosystems. These beneficial effects would outweigh the moderate adverse effect associated with Alternative 1 and the adverse effects of cumulative development projects and construction activities.	Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in a local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on wildlife because of the overall emphasis on restoring disturbed or developed land to natural conditions and improving the health of ecosystems. These beneficial effects would outweigh the adverse effects associated construction-related activities and new development under Alternative 2 and the cumulative development projects.	Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would result in a local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on wildlife because of the overall emphasis on restoring disturbed or developed land to natural conditions and improving the health of ecosystems. These beneficial effects would outweigh the adverse effects associated construction-related activities and new development under Alternative 3 and the cumulative development projects.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES		
Continued use of the Yosemite Lodge area, Camp 4, Northside Drive, Yosemite Creek Bridge, Indian Cultural Center site, Yosemite Creek Pedestrian/ Bicycle Bridge, and the Yosemite Creek diversion dam would result in a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on special-status species. Though unused developed areas within the Yosemite Lodge area would provide somewhat undisturbed habitat for special-status species, overall human use of the Yosemite Lodge area is very high. Continued use of the Yosemite Lodge Area Redevelopment site and associated habitat fragmentation would have a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on special-status species.	Construction-related activities would have a minor to moderate adverse effect on special-status species through habitat disturbance (including tree removal), noise, human presence, and operation of heavy equipment. Implementation of mitigation measures, such as preconstruction surveys, nest monitoring, and avoidance of special-status species and occupied habitat wherever feasible (see Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives), would reduce the magnitude of the adverse construction-related effects on special-status species. The beneficial effects to special-status species and highly valued resources due to riparian and meadow habitat restoration activities, modification of Northside Drive into a multi-use paved trail, and restoration of the natural hydrology of Yosemite Creek would offset the adverse construction- and development-related effects associated with Alternative 2. Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial effect on special-status species.	Like Alternative 2, Alternative 3 construction-related activities would have a minor to moderate adverse effect on special-status species through habitat disturbance (including tree removal), noise, and operation of heavy equipment. Implementation of mitigation measures, such as preconstruction surveys, nest monitoring, and avoidance of special-status species and occupied habitat wherever feasible (see Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives), would reduce the magnitude of the construction-related adverse effects on special-status species. The beneficial effects on special-status species and highly valued resources due to riparian and meadow habitat restoration activities, modification of Northside Drive into a multi-use paved trail, and restoration of the natural hydrology of Yosemite Creek would offset the adverse construction- and development-related effects associated with Alternative 3. Restoration and revegetation activities would have beneficial impacts on habitat for special-status species. Overall, Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial effect on special-status species.
Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects in Yosemite Valley would result in a regional, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact on special-status species through re-establishment of the natural hydrology and fire regime of the Valley and restoration of disturbed and developed land to natural conditions. These beneficial effects would outweigh the moderate adverse effect associated with Alternative 1 and the adverse effects of cumulative development projects and construction activities.	Overall, past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects considered in conjunction with Alternative 2 would have a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial effect on special-status species and their habitats, primarily due to the beneficial effects associated with implementation of large-scale planning efforts that would protect and restore highly valued resource habitats in Yosemite Valley. These restoration efforts would compliment actions under this alternative, which would restore areas of upland, meadow, and riparian habitats that are important to many special-status species.	Overall, current and reasonably foreseeable future projects considered in conjunction with the actions under Alternative 3 would have a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial effect on special-status species and their habitats. This is primarily due to the beneficial effects associated with implementation large-scale planning efforts that would protect and restore highly valued resource habitats in Yosemite Valley. These restoration efforts would compliment actions under this alternative, which would restore areas of upland, meadow, and riparian habitats that are important to many special-status species.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
AIR QUALITY		
Continued wood burning and traffic congestion along Northside Drive and in the local circulation system under Alternative 1 would result in a local, long-term, negligible, adverse impact to air quality in the vicinity of the Yosemite Lodge Area Redevelopment site.	Construction activities associated with Alternative 2 would have a minor to moderate, adverse effect on air quality. As described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, implementation of practices such as watering, covering stockpiles, and covering haul trucks would reduce the intensity of the adverse construction-related emissions to negligible to minor. Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial effect on air quality associated with the substantial decrease in the amount of vehicle emissions on busy days. The beneficial operational effects would offset the long-term but temporary adverse effects to air quality associated with demolition and construction activities and increased nonvehicle operational emissions.	Like Alternative 2, the construction activities associated with Alternative 3 would have a minor to moderate, adverse effect on air quality. As described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, implementation of practices such as watering, covering stockpiles, and covering haul trucks would reduce the intensity of the adverse construction-related emissions to negligible to minor. Overall, Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, negligible, beneficial effect on air quality associated with the reduction of vehicle emissions. The beneficial operational effects would offset the adverse effects to air quality associated with demolition and construction activities and increased nonvehicle operational emissions.
With regard to air quality in the vicinity of the Yosemite Lodge Area Redevelopment site, nonvehicle and vehicle emissions associated with the operation of Camp 4 and Yosemite Lodge under Alternative 1 would not substantially alter the intensity of this minor beneficial impact at the regional and local level.	Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, minor, beneficial effect on air quality. The minor beneficial effects of Alternative 2 associated with reduced nonvehicle operational emissions and vehicle emissions would contribute to the overall beneficial effects of the cumulative projects.	Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, minor, beneficial effect on air quality. The beneficial effects of Alternative 3 associated with reduced vehicle emissions would contribute to the overall beneficial effects of the cumulative projects.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
NOISE		
Alternative 1 would result in a local, long-term, negligible, adverse impact to the noise environment at Camp 4, due to noise generated by traffic on Northside Drive.	Noise generated by demolition and construction activities under Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term but temporary, major, adverse effect on the ambient noise environment during the 13-year construction period. As described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, measures would be employed to mitigate adverse noise impacts, including implementation of standard noise abatement measures during construction (such as schedules that minimize impacts to adjacent noise-sensitive uses), use of best-available noise control techniques where feasible, use of hydraulically or electrically powered impact tools when feasible, and siting of stationary noise sources as far from noise-sensitive uses as possible. Although the mitigation measures would somewhat reduce construction noise levels, during intense periods of construction the noise levels would continue to be substantial and highly noticeable. Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, moderate, adverse effect on the noise environment. The adverse effects associated with construction noise and increases in nonvehicle operational noise would be somewhat offset by the beneficial effects associated with reduced vehicle noise.	As with Alternative 2, noise generated by demolition and construction activities under Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term but temporary, major, adverse effect on the ambient noise environment during the 13-year construction period. As described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, measures would be employed to mitigate adverse noise impacts, including implementation of standard noise abatement measures during construction (such as schedules that minimize impacts to adjacent noise-sensitive uses), use of best-available noise control techniques where feasible, use of hydraulically or electrically powered impact tools when feasible, and siting of stationary noise sources as far from noise-sensitive uses as possible. Although the mitigation measures would somewhat reduce construction noise levels, during intense periods of construction the noise levels would continue to be substantial and highly noticeable. Overall, Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, moderate, adverse effect on the noise environment. The adverse effects associated with construction noise and increases in nonvehicle operational noise would be somewhat offset by the beneficial effects associated with reduced vehicle noise.
The cumulative project construction activity would have a long-term but temporary, substantial adverse effect on the noise environment of Yosemite Valley. Overall, however, the permanent beneficial effects of the cumulative projects associated with reduced regional vehicle trips and related vehicle noise would result in a regional, long-term, minor, beneficial effect on the noise environment. Implementation of Alternative 1 would not increase or reduce noise levels or generate any new sources of noise and therefore would not contribute to this cumulative impact.	Alternative 2 construction-related noise at the project site would contribute to the adverse construction-related noise impacts of the cumulative projects. Overall, however, Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would have a regional, long-term, minor, beneficial impact. The permanent beneficial effect of the reduction in regional vehicle noise would offset the temporary construction-related noise impacts and the small increase in nonvehicle noise associated with Alternative 2.	Alternative 3 construction-related noise at the project site would contribute to the adverse construction-related noise impacts of the cumulative projects. Overall, however, Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would have a regional, long-term, minor, beneficial impact. The permanent beneficial effect of the reduction in regional vehicle noise would offset the temporary construction-related noise impacts and the small increase in nonvehicle noise associated with Alternative 3.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
	CULTURAL RESOURCES	
	ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES	
Alternative 1 would not alter the treatment of archeological resources from their present condition. Potential alteration of an archeological resource would result in a local, long-term, negligible, adverse impact associated with potential damage due to ongoing maintenance, grading and removal of archeological deposits, vandalism, visitor access, and natural processes. Any site-specific planning would be performed in accordance with stipulations in the park's 1999 Programmatic Agreement.	Construction-related activities under Alternative 2 would have a minor to moderate adverse effect on five archeological resources within the construction and demolition footprint. As identified in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, mitigation measures would be implemented, including avoidance, construction monitoring, documentation, interpretation, materials salvage, data recovery, and National Register re-evaluation. With mitigation, Alternative 2 would have a local, permanent, minor, adverse effect on archeological resources associated with construction-related activity and operational disturbances. Any site-specific planning would be performed in accordance with stipulations in the park's 1999 Programmatic Agreement.	Construction-related activities under Alternative 3 would have a minor adverse effect on five archeological resources within the construction and demolition footprint. As identified in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, mitigation measures would be implemented, including avoidance, construction monitoring, documentation, interpretation, data recovery, and National Register re-evaluation. With mitigation, Alternative 3 would have a local, permanent, minor, adverse effect on archeological resources associated with construction-related activity and operational disturbances. Any site-specific planning would be performed in accordance with stipulations in the park's 1999 Programmatic Agreement.
The cumulative projects would have a regional, permanent, minor, adverse impact associated with potential disturbance of individual archeological resources. Alternative 1 would contribute to this effect on a local level due to potential alteration of an archeological resource associated with ongoing maintenance, grading and removal of archeological deposits, vandalism, visitor access, and natural processes.	Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects in Yosemite Valley would result in a regional, permanent, minor, adverse impact on archeological resources. Alternative 2 would contribute to the loss of regional archeological resources as a consequence of the disturbance or degradation of five archeological sites. To mitigate adverse impacts, important information contained in these sites would be recovered according to stipulations of the Programmatic Agreement.	Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects in Yosemite Valley would result in a regional, permanent, minor, adverse impact on archeological resources. Alternative 3 would contribute to the loss of regional archeological resources as a consequence of the disturbance or degradation of five archeological sites. To mitigate adverse impacts, important information contained in these sites would be recovered according to stipulations of the Programmatic Agreement.
	AMERICAN INDIAN TRADITIONAL RESOURCES	
Alternative 1 would not alter the management or treatment of American Indian traditional resources in the project area.	Alternative 2 construction-related activities would have a minor to moderate adverse effect on American Indian traditional resources. As identified in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, mitigation measures would include avoidance, construction monitoring, documentation, interpretation, materials salvage, confining construction activities to the development footprint, revegetation with traditionally used plants, monitoring of plant growth, and watering active construction areas to reduce dust. With mitigation to offset adverse construction impacts, Alternative 2 would have an overall local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on traditional resources due to the development of an Indian Cultural Center. The beneficial impacts	Similar to Alternative 2, Alternative 3 construction-related activities would have a minor to moderate adverse effect on traditional resources. As identified in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, mitigation measures would include avoidance, construction monitoring, documentation, interpretation, materials salvage, confining construction activities to the development footprint, revegetation with traditionally used plants, monitoring of plant growth, and watering active construction areas to reduce dust. With mitigation to offset adverse construction impacts, Alternative 3 would have an overall local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on traditional resources due to the development of an Indian Cultural Center. The beneficial historic

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
	associated with the Indian Cultural Center would largely offset the adverse construction-related impacts of Alternative 2.	impacts associated with the Indian Cultural Center would largely offset the adverse construction-related impacts of Alternative 3.
Disturbance of American Indian traditional resources as a result of the cumulative projects would be considered a regional, long-term, minor, adverse impact associated with potential disturbance of traditional gathering areas or historic village areas. Alternative 1 would not contribute to this effect.	Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would have a regional, long-term, minor, adverse impact on American Indian traditional resources associated with potential disturbance of traditional gathering areas or historic village areas and adverse construction-related effects on traditional resources. The beneficial effects of developing the Indian Cultural Center would not offset the adverse effects of the cumulative projects.	Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would have a regional, long-term, minor, adverse impact on American Indian traditional resources associated with potential disturbance of traditional gathering areas or historic village areas and adverse construction-related effects on traditional resources. The beneficial effects of developing the Indian Cultural Center would not offset the adverse effects of the cumulative projects.
CULTURAL LANDSCAPE RESOURCES, INCLUDING HISTORIC SITES AND STRUCTURES		
Alternative 1 would not alter the management or treatment of cultural landscape resources, including the Yosemite Falls Trail, the Valley Loop Trail, and Camp 4 in the project area.	Alternative 2 would alter two trails and Camp 4, which are eligible for listing or listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The trails are contributing elements to the Yosemite Valley Cultural Landscape as circulation systems. These impacts to cultural landscape resources would be minor and adverse. As identified in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, mitigation measures would include documentation. Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact on cultural landscape resources.	Like Alternative 2, Alternative 3 would alter two trails and Camp 4, resulting in a minor adverse impact on cultural landscape resources. As identified in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, mitigation measures would include data recovery and documentation. Overall, Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact on cultural landscape resources.
As analyzed and disclosed in the Yosemite Valley Plan, disturbance of cultural landscape resources associated with the cumulative projects would be a long-term, minor to major, adverse impact, depending upon the nature, location, and design of the facility to be developed or removed, as well as the quantity and data potential of the individual resources or landscape affected. Alternative 1 would not contribute to this effect.	Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would have a regional, long-term, minor to major, adverse impact on the cultural landscape. Alterations to the cultural landscape at the Yosemite Lodge Area Redevelopment site would contribute to the adverse effects of the cumulative projects.	Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would have a regional, long-term, minor to major, adverse impact on the cultural landscape. Alterations to the cultural landscape at the Yosemite Lodge Area Redevelopment site would contribute to the adverse effects of the cumulative projects.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
	SOCIAL RESOURCES	
	SCENIC RESOURCES	
Alternative 1 would continue to have readily apparent adverse impacts on the local scenic resources of the Yosemite Lodge Area Redevelopment site. Yosemite Lodge would be a visual intrusion from two important vantage points in Yosemite Valley; fire suppression activities resulting in dense forest stands would continue to block key views from the project area; and design of Lodge, Northside Drive, and Camp 4 areas would continue to detract from scenic resources and views of scenic resources, resulting an a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact.	Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on scenic resources compared to Alternative 1. The beneficial effects associated with the proposed facility design improvements, pedestrian-focused site layout, revegetation and restoration activities, and viewshed and forest management efforts would outweigh the adverse effects to scenic resources associated with construction activities and increased developed features at the project site.	Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on scenic resources compared to Alternative 1. The beneficial effects associated with the proposed facility design improvements, pedestrian-focused site layout, revegetation and restoration activities, and viewshed and forest management efforts would outweigh the adverse effects to scenic resources associated with construction activities and increased developed features at the project site.
The beneficial effects of restoring disturbed or developed land to natural conditions and improving the health of ecosystems would outweigh the local, moderate, adverse effect associated with Alternative 1 and the adverse effects of cumulative development projects and construction activities. Therefore, Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects in Yosemite Valley would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on scenic resources.	The cumulative projects in Yosemite Valley would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on scenic resources because of the overall emphasis on restoring disturbed or developed land to natural conditions and improving the health of ecosystems. Alternative 2 would contribute the beneficial effects of the cumulative projects. Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on scenic resources.	The cumulative projects in Yosemite Valley would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on scenic resources because of the overall emphasis on restoring disturbed or developed land to natural conditions and improving the health of ecosystems. Alternative 3 would contribute the beneficial effects of the cumulative projects. Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on scenic resources.
	VISITOR EXPERIENCE	
Over the long term, motel-like lodge structures and facilities would continue to detract from sightseeing opportunities, trails and paths would remain discontinuous with other Valley trails, and the vehicular focus of the area would continue to present a hazard to pedestrians and bicyclists, resulting in a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact on recreation resources in the project area. Signage for trails and multi-use paved trails would continue to be limited, and the connection between the trailhead sign at the Camp 4 parking area and the Valley Loop/Yosemite Falls trail system would remain unclear, resulting in a local, long-term, minor, adverse impact on orientation and interpretation resources. Under Alternative 1, Lodge and Camp 4 facility locations, appearance, number of units, sizing of support facilities, and the level of service experienced by park visitors along Northside Drive would constitute a local, long-term, minor to moderate, adverse impact. Under Alternative 1, continued operation of the Lodge and	Under Alternative 2, construction activities would disrupt use of and access to recreation opportunities in the project area and adjacent areas. Traffic control measures, air quality and noise measures, and implementation of a visitor outreach communication plan, as described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, would be employed to reduce effects related to recreation access. Construction-phase activities under Alternative 2 would result in a local, long-term but temporary, minor, adverse impact in the project area compared to Alternative 1. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in a local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact compared to Alternative 1, due to the provision of additional recreation opportunities and improvement of existing recreation opportunities. Construction activities under Alternative 2 would disrupt orientation and interpretation opportunities in the project area. A visitor outreach communication plan and	Under Alternative 3, construction activities would disrupt use of and access to recreation opportunities in the project area and adjacent areas. Traffic control measures, air quality and noise measures, and implementation of a visitor outreach communication plan, as described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, would be employed to reduce effects related to recreation access. Construction-phase activities under Alternative 3 would result in a local, long-term but temporary, minor, adverse impact in the project area compared to Alternative 1. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in a local, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact compared to Alternative 1, due to the provision of additional recreation opportunities and improvement of existing recreation opportunities. Construction activities under Alternative 3 would disrupt orientation and interpretation opportunities in the project area. A visitor outreach communication plan and

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
Camp 4, including nighttime lighting, would result in a local, long-term, negligible, adverse effect on the night sky in the project area.	construction phasing, as described in Chapter II, Alternatives, and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, would be implemented to reduce effects related to disruption of orientation and interpretation opportunities. Facility construction under Alternative 2 would result in a local, long-term but temporary, minor, adverse impact to orientation and interpretation compared to Alternative 1. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in a local and regional, long-term, moderate to major, beneficial impact compared to Alternative 1, due to the increase in orientation and interpretation opportunities, particularly at the Indian Cultural Center. Under Alternative 2, construction activities would disrupt use of existing visitor-service facilities. Traffic control measures, a visitor outreach communication plan, and construction phasing, as described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, would be implemented to reduce effects related to visitor services. Facility construction under Alternative 2 would result in a local, long-term but temporary, minor to moderate, adverse impact to visitor services compared to Alternative 1. Overall, Alternative 2 would result in a local and regional, long-term, moderate to major, beneficial impact compared to Alternative 1, due to improvements to visitor services in the project area and provision of a new Indian Cultural Center. Construction activities under Alternative 2, with mitigation described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, would result in a local, long-term but temporary, minor, adverse impact to the night sky associated with nighttime lighting. While operation under Alternative 2 would require increased exterior lighting, the design of such lighting (as described in Chapter II, Alternatives) and the application of mitigation measures (as described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives) would result in a local, long-term, negligible, adverse impact to the night sky compared to Alternative 1.	construction phasing, as described in Chapter II, Alternatives, and Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, would be implemented to reduce effects related to disruption of orientation and interpretation opportunities. Facility construction under Alternative 3 would result in a local, long-term but temporary, minor, adverse impact to orientation and interpretation compared to Alternative 1. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in a local and regional, long-term, moderate to major, beneficial impact compared to Alternative 1, due to the increase in orientation and interpretation opportunities, particularly at the Indian Cultural Center. Under Alternative 3, construction activities would disrupt use of existing visitor-service facilities. Traffic control measures, a visitor outreach communication plan, and construction phasing, as described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, would be implemented to reduce effects related to visitor services. Facility construction under Alternative 3 would result in a local, long-term but temporary, minor to moderate, adverse impact to visitor services compared to Alternative 1. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in a local and regional, long-term, moderate to major, beneficial impact compared to Alternative 1, due to improvements to visitor services in the project area and provision of a new Indian Cultural Center. Construction activities under Alternative 3, with mitigation described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives, would result in a local, long-term but temporary, minor, adverse impact to the night sky associated with nighttime utility work. While operation under Alternative 3 would require increased exterior lighting, the design of such lighting (as described in Chapter II, Alternatives) and the application of mitigation measures (as described in Appendix C, Mitigation Measures Common to All Action Alternatives) would result in a local, long-term, negligible, adverse impact to the night sky compared to Alternative 1.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
The cumulative projects would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial effect on visitor experience due to expanded opportunities in the park and improved transit service to more park destinations. Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on visitor experience due to expanded opportunities in the park and improved transit service to more park destinations. The adverse effects of Alternative 1 on visitor experience at and in the vicinity of the project area, the overall reduction of overnight lodging and camping units under the Yosemite Valley Plan, and the potential increase in nighttime lighting in the Valley associated with new facilities would be offset by the beneficial impacts of the cumulative projects.	The cumulative projects would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial effect on visitor experience due to expanded opportunities in the park and improved transit service to more park destinations. Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on visitor experience due to expanded opportunities in the park and improved transit service to more park destinations. The beneficial effects of Alternative 2 on visitor experience would contribute to the cumulative beneficial effect.	The cumulative projects would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial effect on visitor experience due to expanded opportunities in the park and improved transit service to more park destinations. Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would result in a local, long-term, minor, beneficial impact on visitor experience due to expanded opportunities in the park and improved transit service to more park destinations. The beneficial effects of Alternative 3 on visitor experience would contribute to the cumulative beneficial effect.
SOCIOECONOMICS		
Alternative 1 would have a regional, long-term, negligible, beneficial impact on visitor spending and employee housing. The adverse effect associated with substandard employee housing would be offset by the beneficial effect of continued visitor spending associated with project area facilities.	The combined effect of construction spending, visitor spending, and changes in employee housing is expected to result in a long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact to the socioeconomic environment. Impacts associated with construction and visitor spending would be beneficial to the regional socioeconomic environment, and impacts associated with employee housing would be beneficial to the local socioeconomic environment.	The combined effect of construction spending, visitor spending, and changes in employee housing is expected to result in a long-term, negligible to minor, beneficial impact to the socioeconomic environment. Impacts associated with construction and visitor spending would be beneficial to the regional socioeconomic environment, and impacts associated with employee housing would be beneficial to the local socioeconomic environment.
Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would have a regional, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impact on the regional economy. The beneficial effects of continued visitor spending associated with project area facilities would contribute to visitor and construction-related spending in the region.	Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in regional, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on the socioeconomic environment as a result of the additive effects of expected employment and spending increases associated with Alternative 2.	Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would result in regional, long-term, minor to moderate, beneficial impacts on the socioeconomic environment as a result of the additive effects of expected employment and spending increases associated with Alternative 3.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
TRANSPORTATION		
Continued operations at Yosemite Lodge and Camp 4 would cause local, long-term, moderate, adverse impacts to traffic flow and traffic safety conditions due to the unchanged alignment of Northside Drive and unchanged circulation patterns.	Alternative 2 would cause local, short-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts (after mitigation) during site redevelopment; local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts to traffic flow conditions; and local, long-term, minor, beneficial effects on traffic safety/conflicts.	Alternative 3 would cause local, short-term, minor to moderate, adverse impacts (after mitigation) during site redevelopment; local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impacts to traffic flow conditions; and local, long-term, minor, beneficial effects on traffic safety/conflicts.
Collectively, the cumulative projects discussed above would have a local, long-term, major, beneficial impact on transportation conditions within the park. Construction activities associated with the development of the cumulative projects, however, would reduce the intensity of this beneficial impact to a minor or moderate level in the short term. Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would result in a local, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on transportation conditions within the park.	The cumulative projects in Yosemite Valley would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on transportation conditions within the park. The local, short-term, minor to moderate, adverse impact on transportation conditions from project construction activities would be offset by the beneficial impacts of the cumulative projects. The local, long-term, minor, beneficial effect on traffic flow and traffic safety would be enhanced by the beneficial impacts of the cumulative projects.	The cumulative projects in Yosemite Valley would result in a regional, long-term, moderate, beneficial impact on transportation conditions within the park. The local, short-term, minor to moderate, adverse impact on transportation conditions from project construction activities would be offset by the beneficial impacts of the cumulative projects. The local, long-term, minor, beneficial effect on traffic flow and traffic safety would be enhanced by the beneficial impacts of the cumulative projects.
PARK OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES		
The aging utility infrastructure at Camp 4 and Yosemite Lodge, especially the sewer system, would continue to place ongoing demands on facilities management staff for repair and maintenance work. The fire protection capacity of the water system would remain uncertain, potentially presenting visitor protection division firefighters with additional challenges under Alternative 1. Together, these conditions would result in a local, long-term, minor, adverse effect on park operations.	Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on park operations and facilities due to additional staff demands associated with the new facilities and improvements (including restoration and revegetation) in the project area and the increase in the number of visitors that would be accommodated by these facilities. The adverse effect on park operations of Alternative 2 would be partially offset by the beneficial impacts associated with improvements to the existing utility system.	Like Alternative 2, Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on park operations and facilities due to additional staff demands associated with the new facilities and improvements (including restoration and revegetation) in the project area and the increase in the number of visitors that would be accommodated by these facilities. The adverse effect on park operations of Alternative 3 would be partially offset by the beneficial impact associated with improvements to the existing utility and fire protection system.
Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would have a regional, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on park operations and facilities. The adverse impact associated with Alternative 1 (including maintenance demands of the sewer system and the water system) would contribute, to a limited extent, to the adverse effect of increased demand for park operations services and facilities of the cumulative projects.	Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would have a regional, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on park operations and facilities. The adverse impact associated with Alternative 2, including additional demands on park operations staff, would contribute to the adverse effect of increased demand for park operations services and facilities of the cumulative projects.	Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would have a regional, long-term, moderate, adverse impact on park operations and facilities. The adverse impact associated with Alternative 3, including additional demands on park operations staff, would contribute to the adverse effect of increased demand for park operations services and facilities of the cumulative projects.

Table II-2 (Continued)
Summary of Environmental Consequences

Alternative 1 No Action	**Alternative 2** Preferred	**Alternative 3**
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
Alternative 1 would have a local, long-term, minor, beneficial effect due to the continuation of remediation efforts at the site of a former gas station adjacent to Camp 4. The beneficial effects of the alternative would be somewhat offset by adverse effects associated with the small potential for an as-yet-undiscovered underground storage tank at the site to eventually leak. This alternative would have no effect on hazardous materials management in the project vicinity, and because no buildings would be renovated or demolished and no equipment would be disturbed, asbestos fibers and PCBs would not be released to the environment.	Construction activities could result in releases of hazardous materials, resulting in a moderate adverse impact to the environment. Implementation of mitigation measures, such as a spill prevention and pollution control program, preconstruction surveys, and compliance with applicable hazardous materials management regulations, would reduce the magnitude of the adverse impact to negligible to minor. Overall, Alternative 2 would have a local, long-term, negligible, adverse impact on the environment. The beneficial impact of siting new Camp 4 facilities at a remediated site would partially offset the adverse effect of potential releases of hazardous materials into the environment.	As with Alternative 2, construction activities could result in the release of hazardous materials, resulting in a moderate, adverse impact to the environment. Implementation of mitigation measures, such as a spill prevention and pollution control program, preconstruction surveys, and compliance with applicable hazardous materials management regulations, would reduce the magnitude of the adverse impact to negligible to minor. Overall, Alternative 3 would have a local, long-term, negligible, adverse impact on the environment. The beneficial impact of siting new Camp 4 facilities at a remediated site would partially offset the adverse effect of potential releases of hazardous materials into the environment.
Alternative 1 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, negligible, adverse impact on the environment. The adverse effects associated with the use, storage, or accidental release of hazardous materials during construction of the cumulative projects would be largely offset by the beneficial effects of remediation of the former gas station site near Camp 4.	Alternative 2 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, minor, adverse impact on the environment. Alternative 2 would negligibly contribute to the adverse effects of the cumulative projects associated with the use, storage, or accidental release of hazardous materials during construction of the cumulative projects.	Alternative 3 and the cumulative projects would result in a regional, long-term, minor, adverse impact on the environment. Alternative 3 would negligibly contribute to the adverse effects of the cumulative projects associated with the use, storage, or accidental release of hazardous materials during construction of the cumulative projects.